



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/489,293	01/21/2000	Dirk A. Krieger	A-67845/JAS	5656	
75	90 04/09/2004		EXAM	INER	
JAMES A. SHERIDAN			GONZALEZ, JULIO C		
MOSER, PATT	ERSON & SHERIDAN I	L.L.P			
595 SHREWSURY AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SUITE 100			2834		
SHREWSBURY	Y, NJ 07702		DATE MAILED: 04/09/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		09/489,293	KRIEGER ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	1
		Julio C. Gonzalez	2834	AN
	ATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress
THE MAILING DATE C - Extensions of time may be avainter SIX (6) MONTHS from the lift the period for reply specified. If NO period for reply is specified. Failure to reply within the set of	OF THIS COMMUNICATION. ailable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 be mailing date of this communication. I above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply ided above, the maximum statutory period w or extended period for reply will, by statute, ce later than three months after the mailing	IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE of date of this communication, even if timely filed	nely filed s will be considered timely the mailing date of this co D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a) ☐ This action is FIN 3) ☐ Since this applica	ation is in condition for allowar	anuary 2004. action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45		e merits is
Disposition of Claims				
4a) Of the above 5) ☐ Claim(s) is 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-9 and</u> 7) ☐ Claim(s) is	11-18 is/are rejected.	vn from consideration.		
Application Papers				
10) The drawing(s) fil Applicant may not Replacement draw	request that any objection to the oring sheet(s) including the correct	r. epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is objected. Note the attached Office	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CF	• •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119			
12) Acknowledgment a) All b) Som 1. Certified ca 2. Certified ca 3. Copies of tapplication	is made of a claim for foreign e * c) None of: opies of the priority documents opies of the priority documents the certified copies of the prior of from the International Bureau	s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive	on No ed in this National	Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Pa 3) Information Disclosure State Paper No(s)/Mail Date	atent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite	D-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/489,293 Page 2

Art Unit: 2834

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1, 8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is not clear the terminology "therebetween" is meaning in the claims. More clarification is needed.

Moreover, in claim 1, it is disclose "and cooperating with the thrust plate to define a fluid thrust bearing". What is cooperating with the thrust plate, the sleeve? Shaft?

Also, the term "adapted to" is not a positive limitation, but only requires the ability to so perform. It does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. In re Hutchinson, 69 USPQ 138.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2834

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 and 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being 4. unpatentable over Oku (US 6,097,121) in view of Moritan et al (5,822,846) and Kunze et al (US 5,743,015).

Oku discloses a spindle motor for use in a disc drive comprising a shaft 20, a sleeve surrounding the shaft and adjacent the thrust plate 40, a counterplate 42 and supported between upraised axial arms of said sleeve (see figure 1).

Also, the shaft is fixed and the sleeve and counterplate rotate relative to the shaft. Moreover, the sleeve supports a hub 18 and the counterplate and sleeve are fixed to the base 4. Moreover, Oku discloses that the counterplate 42 and the thrust plate 40 are able to retain fluid 44, 46 in between (column 4, line 8).

However, Oku does not disclose that the counterplate is welded to the sleeve.

On the other hand, Moritan et al discloses for the purpose of discharging confined air from the bearing and avoid lubricant leakage that the counter plate 22 can be welded to parts of the motor such as the sleeve 27 (see figure 2a, column 2, lines 9-11).

Moreover, Kunze et al discloses for the purpose of securing effectively a shaft rapidly and reliably in a hole in a metal mounting plate in an axial position Application/Control Number: 09/489,293

Art Unit: 2834

that it is well known in the art the use of welding for the advantages it provides. For example, the sleeve 4 is mention to be welded to a plate 1, which may serve as a counterplate (see abstract) & figure 1.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design a spindle motor as disclosed by Oku and to modify the invention by welding the counter plate to the motor for the purpose of discharging confined air from the bearing and avoid lubricant leakage as disclosed by Moritan et al and to further disclose the use of welding a plate to a sleeve for the purpose of securing effectively a shaft rapidly and reliably in a hole in a metal mounting plate in an axial position as disclosed by Kunze et al.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 01/12/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Moritan et al disclose strong motivations such as obtaining "more height saving configurations", "achieve precise assembling", etc (column 2, lines 10, 11, 15-20) for welding parts like plates to sleeve metal. Moreover, Moritan et al teaches "integration of the thrust plate with a sleeve metal of the bearing" (column 2, line 10, 11). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art

Application/Control Number: 09/489,293

Art Unit: 2834

to weld a plate to the sleeve since it is well known technique in art and such technique provide desirable advantages that are disclosed by Moritan et al.

Kunze et al, also teaches that by welding metal sleeves to metal mounting plates, which can be applied to a counterplates, other advantages can be obtain such as getting small disturbing forces exerted on the shaft-bearing bush, "welding does not affect the axial alignment", "is far more reliable than an adhesive joint, particularly in the case of large temperature fluctuations" (column 1, lines 57, 61-63; column 1, lines 67-column 2, line 2; column 2, lines 6-12).

6. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a thrust plate forms a thrust bearing between itself and the sleeve or shaft and counterplate and is supported from the shaft and teaching an assembly to avoid lubricant leakage) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Art Unit: 2834

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Julio C. Gonzalez whose telephone number is 571-272-2024. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8AM-5PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Darren Schuberg can be reached on 571-272-2044.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)

308-0956.

TRAN NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 6

Jcg

March 31, 2004